DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 802 HE 030 953

AUTHOR Knudson, Linda S.
TITLE Team Leadership in Three Midwestern Community Colleges: The President's Cognitive Frame of Reference and Its Relationship to Real Versus Illusory Teams. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 1997-11-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (22nd, Albuquerque, NM, November 6-9, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; Cooperation; Higher Education; *Leadership; Models; *Teamwork; Theories; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study examined how presidents at three medium-sized community colleges build and influence the functioning of their leadership teams. Interviews with the presidents and 12 team members were conducted to assess perceptions of team operations and effectiveness, and were analyzed in terms of a model of team leadership which suggests three basic functions of teams: utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive. Results were organized into the following categories: team composition, cognitive frames of reference, functional domains, team leadership effectiveness, and team cognitive and functional complexity. Findings indicated that: (1) overall, presidents and team members in the three schools had very similar personal characteristics; (2) presidents used multiple cognitive frames of references and that longevity in position was related to both greater cognitive complexity and greater team effectiveness; (3) presidents viewed team activities in the cognitive domain as most valuable, whereas team members viewed activities in the expressive functional domain as most valuable; (4) team effectiveness was rated slightly higher by team members than by presidents; and (5) all teams were functionally complex, performing useful activities in each of the three functional domains. (Contains 9 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TEAM LEADERSHIP IN THREE MIDWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: THE PRESIDENT'S COGNITIVE FRAME OF REFERENCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO REAL VERSUS ILLUSORY TEAMS

Linda S. Knudson
Johnson County Community College

ED 415 802

HE 030 953

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 6-9, 1997. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

TEAM LEADERSHIP IN THREE MIDWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: THE PRESIDENT'S COGNITIVE FRAME OF REFERENCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO REAL VERSUS ILLUSORY TEAMS

Linda S. Knudson
Johnson County Community College

Overview of the Study

This qualitative study of team leadership in community colleges focused on developing insights about effective means that presidents used to build and influence the functioning of their leadership teams. In-depth interviews of the presidents and 12 team members of three Midwestern community colleges were conducted to capture perceptions of the effectiveness of the teams on which they serve, and to provide a thick, rich description of life within each team. In an attempt to control for any effect that size might have on community college teams, three medium-size community colleges were chosen for this study. The goal was to develop themes and discover lessons learned from the gathered data that could assist other community college leaders in creating functionally and cognitively complex teams.

The study was based on the research of Bensimon and Neumann (1993), who studied fifteen institutions of higher education and found that there were three basic functions of teams: 1) the utilitarian function, to help presidents achieve a sense of rationality and maintain control over institutional functioning; 2) the expressive function, to reinforce a sense of connectedness among team members; and 3) the cognitive function, to enlarge the intelligence of individual team members and to enable the team to act as a creative system. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) discovered that a president who could conceive all of the three team functions, rather than just one or even two, was much more likely to mold a "real" team. Presidents with "real" teams

saw their teams as "performing at least one useful activity in each of the three functional domains" (pg. 45). Conversely, presidents with "illusory" teams used their groups only in one or two of the three functional domains.

The other component of complex "real" teams was cognitive complexity. Cognitively complex teams "perceive, discover, think, create, talk, speculate, and argue together" (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993, pg. 59) through eight "thinking roles" commonly found on a president's team. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) discovered that cognitively complex teams possessed at least four of the five core thinking roles (Definer, Analyst, Interpreter, Critic, Synthesizer), while cognitively simple teams usually lacked two or more of the five core thinking roles.

The influence of the president's cognitive frame(s) of reference on team leadership was also explored. Cognitive frames are conceptual maps for understanding an organization and interpreting the effectiveness of others' behavior. Frames focus the attention of individuals and can also serve as cognitive blinders, leaving what is "out of frame" unseen and unattended. Presidents may use only a single frame, or any of the frames in combination. There are four frames that presidents may use to observe and interpret the community college: 1) the bureaucratic frame, which focuses on structure and organization, and emphasizes setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating through established lines of authority; 2) the collegial frame, which focuses on the achievement of goals through collective action, and emphasizes building consensus, problem solving through teams, loyalty and commitment to the institution, and leading by example; 3) the political frame, which focuses on monitoring internal and external environments, the use of influence to mobilize needed resources, and emphasizes establishing relationships with constituencies, developing coalitions, and constructing

compromises; and 4) the symbolic frame, which focuses on the management of meaning via interpreting the institution's history, maintaining its culture, and reinforcing its values by emphasizing language, myths, stories, and rituals to foster shared meaning and beliefs (Birnbaum, 1992, pg. 63-64).

Research Methodology

The research method selected for this study was the qualitative multi-site case study. The paucity of research on team leadership in higher education, and in community colleges in particular, coupled with the replication of a prior qualitative study suggested the use of qualitative research methods. The sample used for this study consisted of three presidential teams in community colleges in two Midwestern states. The three community colleges were chosen to reflect three distinct geographical settings--a rural community college, a single-campus urban community college, and a suburban community college which is part of a multi-campus system. As size and institutional type were considered as influencing factors in Bensimon and Neumann's (1993) study of team leadership at four-year colleges, the researcher attempted to control for any effects of size in this study by selecting three community colleges of similar size (4,000 to 6,000 students). It was assumed that there would be differences in each institution's culture, resources, and presidential leadership style and cognitive frame of reference.

Presidents and team members of each college were contacted by telephone and letter and asked to participate in the study. The total number of subjects was determined by the reality of the construction of the three selected leadership teams. After obtaining permission to interview the presidents and team members and observe a team meeting, the researcher obtained the following documentation from each team: 1) an organizational chart of the institution; 2) a job

description of each person interviewed; 3) a resume of each person interviewed; 4) a demographic survey about the institution and team composition completed by the presidents; and 5) a demographic survey completed by each team member. Interviews at each college were conducted within a few days of each other in order to preserve the researcher's initial impressions and to more effectively compare team members' responses. The observation of a team meeting was scheduled as closely to the conclusion of the interviews as possible to also help preserve initial impressions and provide for comparative impressions of member behavior outside of, and within, the team.

In order to discover whether or not the Bensimon and Neumann (19993) framework for team leadership works in the community college setting, and because there has been no previous research conducted on community college teams, the researcher used a modified version of the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) interview protocol. Several questions were added and several were eliminated, also shortening the projected interviews to approximately one hour in length. The presidents were given a slightly different interview protocol to assess their cognitive frame(s) of reference in addition to their perceptions about team leadership. Follow-up interviews or conversations were scheduled as necessary to clarify responses or complete the interview protocol. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. The research subjects were given the opportunity to examine transcripts of their interviews for accuracy, and make changes as needed.

Analyses of the data were conducted utilizing methods described by Merriam (1988). A case study data base was assembled for each team that included the interview transcripts, field notes, demographic surveys, collected documentation, team observation checklist, and reflective

memos. A manual coding scheme for four pre-determined categories was developed to capture references to the teams' functional domain(s), the presidents' cognitive frame(s), and the core and supporting cognitive roles. The transcriptions were then coded and analyzed for evidence of the elements in the pre-determined categories and for convergence of themes both within the established categories and outside of the categories. The field notes and the transcribed interviews were compared and contrasted for theme congruence. Next, the transcripts were analyzed for themes within teams, and finally for themes across teams. Similarities and differences were identified within and among the three teams. The final stage was to utilize peer review of transcripts and field notes to confirm or disconfirm that these data were accurately represented in the preliminary findings, and to strive for data exhaustion by identification of contrary data. The researcher also observed an actual team meeting in its naturalistic setting for each case. A team observation checklist and field notes were utilized to determine whether or not the cognitive roles were observed, whether or not the president's cognitive frame of reference was discerned, the level of the team interaction and communication, what issues were dealt with, how cognitively complex the team appeared, and whether or not the three functional domains of leadership teams were observed. Next, the researcher compared and contrasted how well observed team behaviors matched the descriptions of team behavior gained during the individual interviews.

The research was designed to compare and contrast the characteristics and composition of three presidential leadership teams in community colleges of similar size, assess team member perception of the effectiveness of team activities, evaluate the presidents' cognitive frame(s) of reference and the teams' functional domain(s), explore the extent to which the presidents'

cognitive frame(s) influenced the teams' functional domain(s), assess the degree to which the teams were cognitively complex, and determine whether or not the teams were complex "real" teams or simple "illusory" teams.

The research questions were:

1) What are the characteristics and composition of presidential teams in community colleges?

2) How does the community college president's cognitive frame(s) of reference influence the team's functional domain(s)?

3) Are there any differences in the way members of the president's team perceive their participation in team leadership activities and the effectiveness of those activities?

4) How cognitively complex are community college leadership teams?

5) Are presidential teams in community colleges real or illusory?

Summary of the Research Findings

The major results of this study will be summarized to answer the research questions in the following categories: team composition, cognitive frames of reference, functional domains, team leadership effectiveness, and team cognitive and functional complexity.

Composition of Community College Teams

The presidents of the three community colleges in this study were very similar in terms of personal characteristics. They were all Caucasian males in their mid-50s, two of the three held a doctoral degree, and all had substantial experience in community college leadership. There was an average of four team members on the presidential leadership teams in this study,

predominantly Caucasian males in their late 40s, who held the rank of dean or vice president and represented the operational areas of instruction, student services, administrative services, and continuing education. In terms of tenure, the teams in this study were fairly young. The average length of service for team members was two and one half years. Female and/or minority team members represented the newest members of the teams.

Community College Presidents' Cognitive Frames of Reference

Although Bensimon (1989) found that community college presidents' leadership theories tended to cluster in a single frame, the three community college presidents in this study used multiple cognitive frames of reference. Two presidents used three cognitive frames, and the other used a paired-frame orientation. The collegial frame was incorporated in all three presidents' leadership orientations, the political frame in two, the bureaucratic frame in two, and the symbolic frame in one.

In conjunction with Bensimon's (1989) findings, longevity in the position of president positively influenced the community college president's cognitive frame toward greater cognitive complexity. The two multi-framed presidents in this study also had the longest tenure in presidential positions, while the paired-frame president was in the sixth year of his first presidency. In Bensimon's (1989) study, new presidents with one to three years of tenure in office tended to use a single frame leadership theory, and those with five or more years of tenure tended to be multi-framed. This study also supports the view of Bensimon (1989) that presidents who use multiple frames may demonstrate a higher level of cognitive differentiation and integration. The two multi-framed presidents in this study also enacted multiple cognitive roles

that contributed to the teams' cognitive functioning. One president played all eight cognitive roles, while the other played five cognitive roles in both the "core" and "supporting" role areas.

In this study, the president's cognitive frame of reference influenced the team's effectiveness. Presidents primarily functioning in the political frame can be too externally focused, and as a result not spend enough time with the team to fully develop the team's cognitive function and role. Presidents primarily functioning in the collegial frame can be so concerned with consensus that natural conflict is not allowed to surface, thereby stifling some of the team's creativity and communication. Presidents primarily functioning in the bureaucratic frame may make too many decisions themselves, thus cutting off the cognitive power and diversity of the team.

The president's cognitive frame of reference also influenced the team's functional domains. All the community college presidents in this study were multi-framed and all utilized their teams in all three functional domains. If a president were operating from a single frame, s/he might only utilize the team in one or two functional domains.

Community College Team Functional Domains

There was a difference in how presidents and team members viewed the importance of activities in the functional domains. Presidents placed the greatest value on activities performed in the cognitive functional domain, such as surfacing creativity and providing different perspectives, while team members placed the greatest value on activities performed in the expressive functional domain, including communication and providing mutual support.

Community College Team Leadership Effectiveness

Team members on these three community college presidential leadership teams rated their teamwork and the overall effectiveness of their teams slightly higher than teams were rated by the presidents. Although the presidents rated their teams highly, they all expressed the belief that their leadership teams could become more effective.

Three themes emerged that could influence the effectiveness of the president's leadership team either positively or negatively. These themes were the importance of trust and mutual respect, communication, and time for meetings. These themes will be discussed in-depth in the conclusions.

The Bensimon and Neumann model (1993) of presidential team leadership is an appropriate model by which to determine the effectiveness of activities within community college leadership teams. However, several key indicators of effectiveness outside of the team were not explored, such as the quality of the decisions made by the team in terms of institutional effectiveness, the degree to which the team positively influenced the leadership behaviors of others throughout the college, and the perceptions of effectiveness that faculty, staff, and trustees had of the leadership team.

Community College Team Complexity

All teams included in this study were functionally complex, as they performed useful activities in each of the three functional domains. Likewise, the three community college presidential leadership teams in this study were cognitively complex, and exhibited all five of the core cognitive roles as well as all three of the supporting cognitive roles.

Team members and presidents tended to play multiple cognitive roles, and in some cases all team members played a particular role. The roles enacted the most frequently by the presidents were Definer, Interpreter, Synthesizer, and Task Monitor. Team members from the operational areas of student services and human resources tended to play the role of Analyst, and the role of the Critic was most often played by the female and/or minority team members.

All but one of the female team members indicated that they felt an extra burden of responsibility, or greater scrutiny as representatives of their gender, in enacting cognitive roles. Likewise, the two African-American team members in this study indicated that they felt it was their responsibility to bring a "different perspective" or a "minority viewpoint" into the team's thinking. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) reported that female and minority team members often felt out of sync with the rest of the team, but did not make their feelings known. In one case study, an African-American team member was criticized by a teammate for not speaking up more or making more decisions. This minority team member might have been experiencing a form of inadvertent silencing described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). Silencing can occur when team members, such as women and minorities, withhold dissent because their views are not held by the dominant coalition. The silent team members feel alienated from the team, while their teammates are unaware of the subtle ways in which they have excluded or silenced them.

Members of these three community college leadership teams tended to define their roles in operational terms (the position they hold or the groups they represent) rather than in terms of a thinking process. In the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model, the tendency of team members to view their roles in operational terms can be an impediment to the team's cognitive functioning, although that was not the case in this study.

All three community college teams in this study were classified as cognitively and functionally complex, the key indicators of "real" teams, according to the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model. Determining the status of a team as complex and "real" versus simple and "illusory" was not as simple as determining whether or not the teams showed evidence of functional and cognitive complexity. In the Bensimon and Neumann study (1993), the researchers did not observe the teams in action. In this study, teams were observed once to determine whether or not impressions gained during interviews of the presidents and team members matched the perceptions of the team's functioning in their natural setting. In one case, the way team members and the president described the team did not match what the researcher observed.

Although all three teams in this study were complex, "real" teams, each lacked an element of effectiveness as identified by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). One team did not provide adequate time for meetings, one team did not deal with conflict within the team, and one president did not completely empower the team to carry out their leadership duties and responsibilities. Other elements must also be assessed to adequately determine team effectiveness, such as the amount of time the participants spend together in team activities, the quality of the decisions that the team makes, and the degree to which the team models team behavior and thus influences the formation of more participatory structures throughout the campus.

In these three cases, all presidents exhibited behaviors that were also detriments to team functioning: one did not deal with conflict within the team, one did not spend enough time with

his team to be a full member of the team, and the other exhibited bureaucratic behaviors. The leadership orientation of the president, therefore, is a critical factor in determining team success.

Conclusions

Although this study demonstrated that the researcher found real presidential teams in three Midwestern community colleges, there were elements in every case that did not fit the model.

In the Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 49-51) study, institutional size and context influenced real teamwork. Presidents in small institutions were more apt to have real teams, while those in large institutions were unlikely to have real teams. The authors found that tightly coupled smaller institutions were more conducive settings for tightly coupled real teams. This setting is most frequently found in small, private, four-year colleges. The relative absence of real teams in large, public universities is seen by the authors as a result of the political and anarchic nature of these institutions. Leadership in the large universities, according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993), is more likely to rely on "power tactics, negotiation, coalitional dynamics, and persistence more than on collaboration" (pg. 50). University presidents, according to the authors, are more externally focused due to the pressures of fundraising and network building.

Community colleges, however, are also political institutions, and community college presidents need to be externally focused in order to meet the needs of the community. These presidents must deal with locally elected boards of trustees or state governing boards, leaders of business, industry, and government, and the myriad external constituencies who demand services from a comprehensive community college. In a community college setting, "every taxpayer is a person you should listen to," as in most cases the majority of the community college's funding

comes from local sources. A community college president who is unable to use a political cognitive frame would be at a disadvantage in terms of effectiveness in this environment.

The difference in the ways in which community college presidents in medium-size colleges demonstrate leadership internally and externally may provide insight into the reasons why the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model of team leadership works in a community college setting. While community college presidents may function externally like the presidents of large, complex universities as described by Bensimon and Neumann (1993), internally they are increasingly expected to lead in a collegial fashion like the presidents of small, private, four year colleges (Carter and Alfred, 1996). However, this dichotomy can cause community college presidents to become divided in terms of loyalty and goals; on one hand the president must satisfy external constituencies and on the other, must attend to the needs of internal constituencies and the president's leadership team. As illustrated in this study, attending to external needs consumes a great deal of the presidents' time and can diminish the amount of time spent with the leadership team, thus negatively influencing effectiveness.

If the conclusions drawn by Bensimon and Neumann (1993) were taken to their logical conclusion in relation to community college team leadership, one would expect to find the absence of "real" teams due to the political nature of the institutions. Instead, this study has shown that at the three selected community colleges, presidential teams are complex, both functionally and cognitively, and therefore "real" in the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model. This could be due to the size of the institutions studied, as a medium-size community college of 4,000-6,000 students may be more equivalent in size to a small, four year college. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) found that size makes a difference in whether or not teams are found; small,

four-year colleges were the institutions in which the authors found the most teams. Another possible explanation is the leadership orientation of the three presidents in this study. All three used the collegial frame, and for two presidents the collegial frame appeared to be the primary frame they used. It is also noteworthy that all three presidents in this study were promoted from within their institutions. It is not clear what impact promotion from within had on the presidents' cognitive frames of reference. On one hand, promotion from within could influence a more collegial leadership orientation, as it may be difficult to view former peers as subordinates. Or, as Vaughan described (1989, pg. 42), promotion from within could considerably narrow the leadership orientation, as the president may be preoccupied with the previous area of responsibility.

Although community colleges are political institutions like the large, complex universities, there is another difference that may explain why teams would more likely appear in community colleges than in universities. Universities, according to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 50), may be inhospitable to team leadership due to their "anarchic qualities" and to their tendency to act as "adhocracies." Since community colleges are structurally smaller and more tightly coupled than large universities, the culture and climate may be more conducive to teams. Community colleges are very egalitarian in nature (Cohen and Brawer, 1996), in that they attempt to serve the learning needs all segments of the community, whether they be youth, traditional students, non-traditional students, persons with disabilities, or older adults. Likewise, it is common to find a wide range of participation on college standing committees, including faculty, students, administrators, members of the staff, and occasionally representatives of the governing board.

The greatest pitfalls in building community college executive leadership teams may reside in the pressure exerted on the president from outside the institution. Community college presidents are increasingly pulled "into the vortex of what four-year presidents have for years referred to as the external presidency" (Vaughan, 1994, pg. 1). Satisfying internal needs may be left to the leadership team, but in doing so the team is not able to fully take advantage of the president's cognitive contributions. The external focus coupled with the internal demands of leading a community college may explain why each of the three teams in this study, although technically "real" in the Bensimon and Neumann (1993) model, exhibit factors that impinge on team effectiveness. External pressures pull time and attention away from team activities, and coupled with the president's external orientation, a team could be left to function on its own. In a highly political climate, the president needs the team to move the institution forward, but has less available time to attend to the team.

Even though the three teams in this study met the criteria for functional and cognitive complexity, in every case there were indicators of simple teamwork. In one case study, an externally-oriented president in the political frame spent a great deal of time away from his team attending to political activities. As a result, the three team members felt that they were more of a team without the president than with him, and sometimes worked together on important issues as a team without the president. In another case, a president functioning in the collegial frame was so concerned with consensus that natural conflict was not allowed to surface, causing team members to either stifle conflict and thus stifle creative decision making, or deal with conflict outside of the team thus diminishing the expressive function of teamwork. In the third case, a president in the bureaucratic frame, even though it may not be his primary lens, tended to reserve

decision making to himself and thus micro-manage the team. As a result, team members felt frustration that they were not given the authority and responsibility to carry out their job functions absent of close supervision.

This study points out the critical role that presidents play in building and maintaining a complex team. In the three community colleges in this study, the president primarily provides the vision and defines the team's agenda, interprets how the community will perceive the issues, builds and articulates a summative picture of the team's reality, and facilitates the team's work processes. It has been demonstrated in these three case studies that the president's cognitive frame influences the team's functioning. A president in the collegial frame may encourage and support teamwork and consensual decision making, but may also avoid conflict and thereby stifle the cognitive creativity that arises from disagreement and debate. Suppressing conflict does not enhance collegiality or the care and compassion of team members. According to Bensimon and Neumann (1993, pg. 109), connected team members should feel the emotions of their teammates, whether it is "anger, frustration, satisfaction, or commitment." A president in the bureaucratic frame may help the team organize and set priorities, but also hold power and decision making so closely that team members are unable to function very effectively as a team. A president in the political frame may be adept in team building by using influence and skills in building relationships, but may be externally focused to the point that the team essentially functions alone. A president in the symbolic frame may bring skills in creating the team's culture, rituals, and language, but may also ignore the day-to-day processes of teamwork.

This study also demonstrates that there is difference in the way team members and presidents view the most important functions of the leadership team. For presidents, the most

important functions were in the cognitive domain, but for team members the most important functions were in the expressive domain. For team members, a fully functioning team means that their emotive needs are being met--that there is trust, mutual respect, mutual support, and caring. A group that *calls* itself a team may keep a college running effectively, but *being* a team to the members in this study implies a need to feel and believe that the team collective is important. In one of these cases, the team members expressed a desire for more social interaction. In concert, Bensimon and Neumann's (1993) research suggested that effective teams strike a balance between task accomplishment and solidarity. According to the authors, the time team members spend together socially may be as important to the team's functioning as the time spent together getting things done. Bolman and Deal (1992) also found that the use of humor and play within the team reduced tension and encouraged creativity.

Some presidents may not attend as much to the team's expressive needs as the team members would like. Some presidents are particularly adept at paying attention to expressive needs even though there is little social interaction away from work. Attending to the team collective is important to both presidents and team members. Regular meetings, a high level of communication, demonstrating care and connection, and creating a climate of trust and mutual respect are important messages that what the team is doing is valued and important to the college.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this study suggest several implications for practice.

1. The formation of a presidential leadership team is a conscious decision on the part of the president and potential team members. Time, effort, and resources must be invested by all players to fully realize the potential of a leadership team.

2. Becoming an effective team is enhanced by training in the philosophy and practices of team leadership. Team members need a common vocabulary and definition of team leadership terms, including the functional domains, cognitive roles, and cognitive frames in order to fully understand the dynamics of cognitive team leadership.

3. When the team acquires new team members and as team dynamics change, retraining in team techniques will be needed for all team members to integrate the new member. When a new member joins the team, it changes the team's dynamics and makes it necessary to go through the team formation stage once again.

4. The processes of team leadership take time. Presidents and team members should be prepared to invest a considerable amount of time in team training and development, and in doing the cognitive work that is required for an effectively functioning leadership team.

5. Teams need developing, nurturing, and support. As a result, presidents need to be willing to develop skills for attending to the team members' emotive needs. A mechanism to regularly provide presidents and team members feedback on team dynamics, and to check perceptions regarding team functioning, should be established.

6. Presidents and team members need training in how to deal with conflict, as conflict is inevitable, healthy, contributes to the cognitive complexity of the team, and facilitates change. Conflict that is appropriately managed does not negatively impact either the expressive or cognitive functions of the team.

7. A concentrated effort to build trust and mutual respect is key to the development of an effective leadership team. Mutual trust may be the most important variable in team leadership effectiveness. Without trust, there can be no team.

8. In order to become a cognitive team, team members must understand the difference between operational role or position and cognitive roles, and be encouraged to participate in enacting one or more cognitive roles. In addition, as cognitive diversity contributes positively to team effectiveness, a concerted effort should be made to provide an open, and supportive environment where cognitive diversity can be safely explored.

9. It is important for the team to value and support the role of the Critic. In this study, the Critic was played by the female and/or minority team members. It may be difficult for team members who are not part of the dominant culture to speak up on issues, especially when their opinions differ from those in the majority. When the role of the Critic is enacted by a woman or a member of a minority group, dominant members may discount their views and thus negatively impact the cognitive diversity of the team. Critics of any gender or ethnicity are essential to the team, as they raise issues and recognize differences that others may prefer not to acknowledge.

10. As a fully functioning team is functionally complex, team members and presidents need to be certain that the team performs useful and meaningful activities in the utilitarian, expressive, and cognitive functional domains.

Summary

In summary, this qualitative study of team leadership in community colleges has examined the relationship between the presidents' cognitive frame of reference and its influence on team effectiveness. The study has revealed that the effectiveness of the process of team

leadership, in terms of the activities undertaken and decisions made, is dependent upon team member mutuality, a clearly defined vision and common goals, trust and mutual respect among all team members, a jointly defined agenda, inclusivity, shared leadership, diversity of perspectives, attending to and valuing all input, and meeting the needs of team members for respect, development, self actualization, and success.

REFERENCES

Bensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. Review of Higher Education, 12(2), 107-123.

Bensimon, E. M. and Neumann, A. (1993). Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1992). What makes a team work? Organizational Dynamics, 21(2), 34-44.

Carter, P. and Alfred, R. (1996). Breaking out of the box: New colleges for a new century. 1996 Critical Issues Paper, Consortium for Community College Development.

Cohen, A. M. and Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American community college (3rd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989). Leadership in transition: The community college presidency. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Vaughan, G. B. (1994). Institutionalization: The community college president's greatest challenge. Leadership Abstracts, 7(8), 1-2.